



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/668,093	09/19/2003	Charlie Sherlock	FRK 1648-004	1287
8698	7590	01/18/2005		
STANLEY LAW GROUP LLP 495 METRO PLACE SOUTH SUITE 210 DUBLIN, OH 43017			EXAMINER NGUYEN, TAI T	
			ART UNIT 2632	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 01/18/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/668,093	SHERLOCK, CHARLIE	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Tai T. Nguyen	2632	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 September 2003.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 19 September 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>03/15/04</u> . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to because all numeric blocks need to be labeled with descriptive legends according to 37CFR 1.84(o). Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.
2. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the "signal generator"

and "external monitoring station" must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Art Unit: 2632

4. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

5. Regarding claim 10, the phrase "such as" renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear whether the limitations following the phrase are part of the claimed invention.

See MPEP § 2173.05(d).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

7. Claims 1-3 and 5-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Stanley-Aeslanok et al. (US 5,225,806).

Regarding claim 1, Stanley-Aeslanok et al. disclose a system (figure 4) for monitoring an environment comprising:

a plurality of sensors (25) each sensor generating respective events in response to activity in the environment (figure 4);

a processor (31) in operative associated with the sensors (col. 1, lines 11-20);

and

at least one stored set of linked events (32) accessible to the processor, wherein the processor being responsive to an event being generated by a sensor to determine

whether the event being in a sequence of events corresponding to a stored set of link event and to generate an alarm (43) therefrom (figures 5-7; col. 2, line 41 through col. 3, line 34).

Regarding claims 2-3 and 5, Stanley-Aeslanok et al. disclose at least one of the plurality of sensors comprises an authorizing sensor (30) arranged to authenticate an individual's identity, wherein at least one event in at least one of the at least one stored set of linked events includes authentication of an individual by the authorizing sensor (figure 2, col. 3, lines 24-33).

Regarding claims 6-7, Stanley-Aeslanok et al. discloses the environment comprises a premise (10) having at least one entry point (15, 20) providing access from the exterior, wherein the system includes a sensor (25) associated with each entry point and being operable to detect whether a door/window at the at least one entry has been opened, whereby the processor being arranged to generate an alarm unless a sensor associated with an access point generates an event in sequence with authentication of an authorized individual by the authorizing sensor and matching a stored set of linked event (col. 3, lines 24-33).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 4 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stanley-Arslanok et al. (US 5,225,806).

Regarding claim 4, Stanley-Arslanok et al. disclose the instant claimed invention except for the processor being adapted to track the location of any individual within the premise. Since Stanley-Arslanok et al. disclose the premise having a plurality of rooms (11, 12) and a door (15D) being connected therebetween (figure 3) and each of the access door/window associated with a sensor (figure 5), it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to know that the processor can be used to track the location of any individual within the premise upon receiving an output signal from each of any particular sensor in order to generate an alarm to alert an user of the entry of an unauthorized.

Regarding claim 8, Stanley-Arslanok et al. the premise includes a plurality of rooms (11-12) connected by an interior door (15D). Stanley-Arslanok et al. disclose the instant claimed invention except for a sensor associated with the interior door, the sensor being operable to detect when the door has been opened/closed and wherein at least one events in the at least one stored set of linked events includes door opening. Figure 4 of Stanley-Arslanok et al. show that door (15D) being set to arm in mode A, D, and E. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to know that the interior door (15D) should include a sensor associated therein for the purpose of monitoring access therefrom in order to generate an alarm event if the accessing is an unauthorized.

Art Unit: 2632

10. Claims 9-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stanley-Arslanok et al. (US 5,225,806) in view of Naidoo et al. (US 6,658,091).

Regarding claim 9, Stanley-Arslanok et al. disclose a plurality of sensor associated with door/window at any access point but fail to disclose the specific heat and/or motion sensors in addition to contact and/or vibration sensors in operative associated with the door/window at any access point. Naidoo et al. teach a security system (figure 1) including a plurality of heat and/or motion sensors in addition to contact and/or vibration sensors in operative associated with the door/window at any access point (col. 7, lines 17-23). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the heat and/or motion sensors in addition to contact and/or vibration sensors as taught by Naidoo et al. in the system as disclosed by Stanley-Arslanok et al. as modified, for the purpose of sensing/detecting/monitoring any unauthorized access therefrom.

Regarding claim 10, Stanley-Arslanok et al. disclose the instant claimed invention except for at least one video camera in operative associated with the processor, such that on detection the processor activates the video camera to record of the unauthorized individual. Naidoo et al. teach the security system including a video camera (112) associated with a security gateway (115), upon detection the processor activates the video camera to record of the unauthorized individual (figure 1). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the video camera as taught by Naidoo et al. in

the system as disclosed by Stanley-Arslanok et al. as modified, for the purpose of capturing the image of the unauthorized individual for evidence.

Regarding claims 11-12, Stanley-Arslanok et al. disclose the instant claimed invention except for signal generator for providing of unauthorized individual on the premise to an external monitoring station. Naidoo et al. teach the security system including a signal generator for providing of unauthorized individual on the premise to an external monitoring station (figure 1). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the signal generator for providing of unauthorized individual on the premise to an external monitoring station as taught by Naidoo et al. in the system as disclosed by Stanley-Arslanok et al., as modified, for the purpose of providing a condition of intrusion to a remote location for verification and response.

Conclusion

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Andy (US 6,472,993), Lyons et al. (US 6,411,209), and Heckett (US 4,367,458).

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tai T. Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-2961. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 7:30am-5:00pm..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Daniel J. Wu can be reached on (571) 272-2964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Tai T. Nguyen
Examiner
Art Unit 2632

January 13, 2005